arXiv:hep-ph/0003119v4 22 Mar 2000

TECHNION-PH-00-25
EFI-2000-8
hep-ph/0003119
March 2000

THE ROLE OF $B_s \to K\pi$ IN DETERMINING THE WEAK PHASE γ [1]

Michael Gronau
Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, 32000 Haifa, Israel

and

Jonathan L. Rosner
Enrico Fermi Institute and Department of Physics
University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637

ABSTRACT

The decay rates for $B^0 \to K^+\pi^-$, $B^+ \to K^0\pi^+$, and the charge-conjugate processes were found to provide information on the weak phase $\gamma \equiv \mathrm{Arg}(V_{ub}^*)$ when the ratio r of weak tree and penguin amplitudes was taken from data on $B \to \pi\pi$ or semileptonic $B \to \pi$ decays. We show here that the rates for $B_s \to K^-\pi^+$ and $\bar{B}_s \to K^+\pi^-$ can provide the necessary information on r, and estimate the statistical accuracy of forthcoming measurements at the Fermilab Tevatron.

PACS codes: 12.15.Hh, 12.15.Ji, 13.25.Hw, 14.40.Nd

The measurement of phases of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix [1] is a crucial test of our understanding of CP violation. Various aspects of the decays $B \to K\pi$, in particular, have been shown to provide information on the weak phase $\gamma \equiv \mathrm{Arg}(V_{ub}^*)$ [2, 3]. In Ref. [3] we showed that ratios of partial decay rates for charged and neutral B mesons to $K\pi$ final states yielded γ when supplemented with information on the ratio r of weak tree and penguin amplitudes. It was necessary to extract r either from data on $B \to \pi\pi$ or from semileptonic $B \to \pi$ decays.

In the present Letter we show that the decays [4] $B_s \to K^-\pi^+$ and $\bar{B}_s \to K^+\pi^-$, which are related by U-spin to the processes $B^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$, respectively, can provide the necessary information on r. We describe the constraints available by including information on these processes, and estimate the statistical power of forthcoming measurements at the Fermilab Tevatron.

We use the same procedure as Ref. [3], which may be consulted for further details. However, for convenience, we shall decompose our amplitudes into "tree" and "penguin" contributions in a somewhat different manner.

---

[1] To be submitted to Physics Letters B.

We define the following charge-averaged ratios:

$$R \equiv \frac{\Gamma(B^0 \to K^+\pi^-) + \Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+)}{\Gamma(B^+ \to K^0\pi^+) + \Gamma(B^- \to \bar{K}^0\pi^-)} \quad , \tag{1}$$

$$R_s \equiv \frac{\Gamma(B_s \to K^-\pi^+) + \Gamma(\bar{B}_s \to K^+\pi^-)}{\Gamma(B^+ \to K^0\pi^+) + \Gamma(B^- \to \bar{K}^0\pi^-)} \quad , \tag{2}$$

and CP-violating rate (pseudo-)asymmetries:

$$A_0 \equiv \frac{\Gamma(B^0 \to K^+\pi^-) - \Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+)}{\Gamma(B^+ \to K^0\pi^+) + \Gamma(B^- \to \bar{K}^0\pi^-)} \quad , \tag{3}$$

$$A_s \equiv \frac{\Gamma(B_s \to K^-\pi^+) - \Gamma(\bar{B}_s \to K^+\pi^-)}{\Gamma(B^+ \to K^0\pi^+) + \Gamma(B^- \to \bar{K}^0\pi^-)} \quad . \tag{4}$$

The amplitudes for $B \to K\pi$ were expressed in Ref. [3] in terms of "tree" and "penguin" contributions involving CKM factors $V^*_{ub}V_{us}$ and $V^*_{tb}V_{ts}$, respectively. Using the unitarity of the CKM matrix, it is more convenient in our case to decompose the amplitudes into terms containing $V^*_{ub}V_{us}$ and $V^*_{cb}V_{cs}$. This decomposition is in accordance with the structure of the $\Delta B = 1,\ \Delta C = 0,\ \Delta S = -1$ effective Hamiltonian [5]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\left[V^*_{ub}V_{us}\left(\sum_1^2 c_i Q_i^{us} + \sum_3^{10} c_i Q_i^s\right) + V^*_{cb}V_{cs}\left(\sum_1^2 c_i Q_i^{cs} + \sum_3^{10} c_i Q_i^s\right)\right] \quad , \tag{5}$$

where the flavor structure of the various short-distance operators is $Q^{qs}_{1,2} \sim \bar{b}q\bar{q}s,\ Q^s_{3,..,6} \sim \bar{b}s\sum \bar{q}'q',\ Q^s_{7,..,10} \sim \bar{b}s\sum e_{q'}\bar{q}'q'$.

The amplitude of $B_s \to K^-\pi^+$ is obtained from the one for $B^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ by a U-spin transformation, $s \leftrightarrow d$, acting both on the effective Hamiltonian and on the initial and final hadronic states. The ratios of the corresponding two CKM factors occuring in these amplitudes are $V^*_{ub}V_{ud}/V^*_{ub}V_{us} = 1/\tilde{\lambda}$ and $V^*_{cb}V_{cd}/V^*_{cb}V_{cs} = -\tilde{\lambda}$, where $\tilde{\lambda} = |V_{us}/V_{ud}| = |V_{cd}/V_{cs}| = \tan\theta_c \simeq 0.226$.

In a convention where the coefficient of the strangeness-changing penguin amplitude in $B^+ \to K^0\pi^+$ is taken to be real and positive, we then have

$$A(B^+ \to K^0\pi^+) = A(B^- \to \bar{K}^0\pi^-) = P + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\lambda}^2) \quad , \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A(B^0 \to K^+\pi^-) &= -[P + Te^{i(\delta+\gamma)}] \quad , \\ A(\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+) &= -[P + Te^{i(\delta-\gamma)}] \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A(B_s \to K^-\pi^+) &= \tilde{\lambda}P - (1/\tilde{\lambda})Te^{i(\delta+\gamma)} \quad , \\ A(\bar{B}_s \to K^+\pi^-) &= \tilde{\lambda}P - (1/\tilde{\lambda})Te^{i(\delta-\gamma)} \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Here δ is the strong phase difference between the tree and penguin amplitudes. The $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\lambda}^2)$ term in Eq. (6) is the relative contribution of the $V^*_{ub}V_{us}$ term in comparison with the dominant $V^*_{cb}V_{cs}$ term. The effects of this term could be amplified if rescattering is important. Various estimates [6] consider this possibility to be unlikely, but it can be checked by measuring the CP-violating rate difference between $B^+ \to K^0\pi^+$ and $B^- \to \bar{K}^0\pi^-$ or by improving bounds on the charge-averaged rate of the U-spin related decay $B^\pm \to K^0(\bar{K}^0)K^\pm$. Also, when using isospin symmetry in Eqs. (6) and (7) to assume equal penguin amplitudes in B^+ and B^0 decays, we have neglected color-suppressed electroweak penguin contributions [7]. Their effects on determining γ were studied in [3], and ways for controlling these small terms were discussed in [8].

In the above equations we have taken P and T to be real but of indeterminate sign. Calculations based on the factorization hypothesis or free-quark estimates [3] suggest $T > 0$, $P < 0$, $\delta \approx 0$. We define the ratio $r \equiv T/P$. One then expects $r < 0, \delta \approx 0$ in the factorization limit. Note that this definition differs from the one in [3], since the present definition of T contains a contribution from the $V^*_{ub}V_{uq}$ term ($q = d, s$) in the penguin amplitude of Ref. [3].

The charge-averaged ratios and charge asymmetries are now given by

$$R = 1 + r^2 + 2r\cos\delta\cos\gamma \quad , \tag{9}$$

$$R_s = \tilde{\lambda}^2 + (r/\tilde{\lambda})^2 - 2r\cos\delta\cos\gamma \quad , \tag{10}$$

$$A_0 = -A_s = -2r\sin\gamma\sin\delta \quad . \tag{11}$$

The expressions for R and A_0 are those given in Ref. [3], with a sign change in the term proportional to r corresponding to our different convention for labeling amplitudes. The expressions for R_s and A_s provide new information.

Notice that since both R_s and A_s involve the ratios of strange and nonstrange B partial widths, their measurement in a hadronic experiment will demand a better estimate of the relative production fraction of strange and nonstrange B mesons. (The CDF detector at the Tevatron has measured this ratio to be $f_s/(f_u + f_d) = 0.213 \pm 0.068$ [9].) One way to accomplish this will be to compare same-sign and opposite-sign lepton pair production [10].

The equation for R_s provides an opportunity to learn the magnitude of r, related to a quantity estimated previously [3] with the help of $B \to \pi\pi$ or $B \to \pi\ell\nu_\ell$ decays. Adding Eqs. (9) and (10), we find

$$R + R_s = (1 + \tilde{\lambda}^2)(1 + \frac{r^2}{\tilde{\lambda}^2}) \quad , \quad \text{or} \quad |r| = \tilde{\lambda}\left[\frac{R + R_s}{1 + \tilde{\lambda}^2} - 1\right]^{1/2} \quad . \tag{12}$$

Once $|r|$ is known we can establish a useful bound on γ independent of any possible CP-violating charge-asymmetry. We write

$$(R - 1 - r^2)^2 = 4r^2\cos^2\delta\cos^2\gamma \leq 4r^2\cos^2\gamma \quad , \tag{13}$$

implying

$$|\cos\gamma| \geq \frac{|R - 1 - r^2|}{2|r|} \ , \tag{14}$$

or

$$|\sin\gamma| \leq \frac{[-\lambda(1, R, r^2)]^{1/2}}{2|r|} \quad , \quad \lambda(a, b, c) \equiv a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - 2ab - 2ac - 2bc \quad . \tag{15}$$

The limiting cases of an equality, in which γ is determined up to a twofold ambiguity, $\gamma \to \pi - \gamma$, correspond to $\delta = 0$ or $\delta = \pi$. Assuming that the strong phase difference between T and P is small, as indicated by perturbative QCD arguments [11, 12], measurements of R and R_s already determine γ. Note that we expect $r < 0$ for a vanishing final-state phase δ, in which case one has

$$\cos\gamma = \frac{1 + r^2 - R}{2|r|} \ . \tag{16}$$

In case that the strong phase is large, one expects to measure nonzero asymmetries $A_0 = -A_s$, which together with R and R_s would determine γ. As quoted previously [3], by eliminating δ from the equations for R and A_0, one finds

$$R = 1 + r^2 \pm \sqrt{4r^2\cos^2\gamma - A_0^2\cot^2\gamma} \quad , \tag{17}$$

which can then be solved for $\sin^2\gamma$ up to a two-fold ambiguity when $A_0 \neq 0$.

We have treated the systematic effects associated with theoretical uncertainties in our method in Ref. [3]. There it was shown that an error on γ of about 10° could be achieved if one obtained an error of about 10% on r (defined in a somewhat different manner) for the value favored there, $r = 0.16$. When obtaining r using the measurement of R and R_s, the statistically limiting measurement is likely to be that of R_s, since the B_s is expected to be produced less copiously than the B^0, and the tree amplitude $T/\tilde{\lambda}$ dominating the decay $B_s \to K^-\pi^+$ is expected to be smaller than the amplitude P dominating the decay $B^0 \to K^+\pi^-$. In one estimate [13, 14], the ratio of produced $B_s \to K^-\pi^+ : B^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ events is expected to be 1:8.

As one example, we take $R = 1$ (the present experimental value is 1.01 ± 0.30 [15]), and find that $r = 0.16 \pm 0.016$ corresponds to $R_s = 0.58^{+0.11}_{-0.10}$. Thus, one must measure R_s to about $\pm 18\%$ in order to achieve a 10% measurement of r. This would require about 30 events of $B_s \to K^-\pi^+$ or $\bar{B}_s \to K^+\pi^-$, whereas a sample of about 2000 to 4000 untagged events, two orders of magnitude larger, is envisioned for Run II at the Tevatron [13, 14].

It is sufficient to use untagged events since the rapid B_s–$\bar{B}_s$ mixing ensures that the effective production rates for $B_s \to K^-\pi^+$ and $\bar{B}_s \to K^+\pi^-$ will be very nearly identical at each value of rapidity. While this is not so for $B^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$, it is true in proton-antiproton collisions if one averages over rapidity in a symmetric detector. Otherwise, one must know the individual production rates for B^0 and $\bar{B}^0$ *before mixing*. These can be measured, for example using self-tagging processes such as $B^0 \to J/\psi K^{*0}$ where the CP-violating asymmetry is expected to be small, or with the help of an assumption of isospin invariance and a corresponding measurement of B^+ and B^- production using self-tagging modes with small CP asymmetry such as $B^\pm \to J/\psi K^\pm$ [16].

In order to estimate the systematic error associated with our flavor SU(3) approximation, we adopt the often used assumption of factorized tree and penguin amplitudes. In this approximation, SU(3) breaking introduces in the ratio $A(B_s \to K^-\pi^+)/A(B^0 \to K^+\pi^-)$ a relative factor $f_1 = F_{B_sK}(m_\pi^2)f_\pi/F_{B\pi}(m_K^2)f_K$, involving the product of corresponding ratios of form factors and decay constants describing $B_s \to K\pi$ and $B \to K\pi$.

Although B decay form factors to K and π have not yet been measured, their ratio is expected to be somewhat larger than one; quark model [17] and QCD sum rule [18] calculations find $F_{B_sK}(m_\pi^2)/F_{B\pi}(m_K^2) \simeq 1.16$. With $f_K/f_\pi = 1.22$, SU(3) breaking is expected to introduce a systematic uncertainty of only a few percent, $f_1 \simeq 0.95$.

An actual check of the SU(3) (or U-spin) approximation relies on the asymmetry prediction $A_s = -A_0$, or, in fact, on the prediction of equal CP-violating rate differences in $B^0 \to K\pi$ and $B_s \to K\pi$. Including SU(3) breaking, one expects

$$\Gamma(B_s \to K^-\pi^+) - \Gamma(\bar{B}_s \to K^+\pi^-) = -f_1^2[\Gamma(B^0 \to K^+\pi^-) - \Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+)] \ . \quad (18)$$

With 2000 events of $B_s \to K^-\pi^+$ or $\bar{B}_s \to K^+\pi^-$, one should be able to check this prediction to a fractional accuracy of $(2000)^{-1/2} \simeq 2.2\%$ which seems adequate for a precise determination of f_1. This factor can then be included in the analysis leading to a determination of γ. Note, however, that a very small strong phase difference δ may not permit useful asymmetry measurements. (The strong phases in $B^0 \to K\pi$ and $B_s \to K\pi$ differ in broken SU(3), in spite of the fact that the final states in both decays are $K^\pm\pi^\mp$. This is similar to the case of $K\pi$ states produced in Cabibbo-favored and double-Cabibbo-suppressed D decays [19].)

The processes studied here, $B^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ and $B_s \to K^-\pi^+$, are related by a spectator quark transformation, $d \leftrightarrow s$, to another pair of U-spin related processes $B_s \to K^+K^-$ and $B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$. The amplitudes of these two pairs of processes are equal, respectively, in the limit of flavor SU(3) symmetry and neglecting smaller "exchange" and "penguin annihilation" amplitudes [20]. These contributions are expected to be very small unless rescattering is important [6]. This can be tested by measuring the rates for $B^0 \to K^+K^-$ or $B_s \to \pi^+\pi^-$ which are due solely to exchange and penguin annihilation amplitudes. Including an SU(3) breaking factor $f_2 = F_{B_sK}(m_K^2)/F_{B\pi}(m_K^2) \approx F_{B_sK}(m_\pi^2)/F_{B\pi}(m_\pi^2) \simeq 1.16$, as expected in the factorization approximation, one has

$$\begin{aligned} A(B_s \to K^+K^-) &= f_2 A(B^0 \to K^+\pi^-) \ , \\ A(B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-) &= f_2^{-1} A(B_s \to K^-\pi^+) \ . \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The rates of these four processes can be used to check the factorization assumption and to determine the SU(3) breaking factor f_2. A study of γ through time-integrated rates of $B_s \to K^+K^-$, $B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and their charge-conjugates is very similar and complementary to the one using $B^0/\bar{B}^0 \to K^\pm\pi^\mp$ and $B_s/\bar{B}_s \to K^\mp\pi^\pm$.

The present proposal for determining γ is also complementary to the method comparing time-dependent asymmetry measurements in $B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and in $B_s \to K^+K^-$ [13, 21]. In that method, one measures both an oscillation amplitude and an oscillation phase for both channels, i.e., four quantities, and thereby extracts four unknowns: the ratio of tree and penguin amplitudes (equivalent to our r), a strong final-state phase δ between tree and penguin assumed to be the same for $\pi^+\pi^-$ and K^+K^-, and two weak phases β and γ. One must tag the flavor of the neutral mesons at time of production.

We comment briefly on the relation between the two methods. The present method has the following advantages:

(1) It requires neither time-dependent measurements nor flavor tagging for B^0 and B_s.

(2) The kinematic peaks associated with $B^0 \to K\pi$ and $B_s \to K\pi$ are well-separated from one another and reasonably well separated from those corresponding to $B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $B_s \to K^+K^-$ (which lie between them and are nearly on top of each other), even without particle identification [13, 14]. To see this, we note that in the limit of relativistic pions or kaons, the mass m_{21} of a $\pi\pi$, $K\pi$, or $K\bar{K}$ system is given by

$$m_{12} = \left[m_1^2\left(1+\frac{p_2}{p_1}\right) + m_2^2\left(1+\frac{p_1}{p_2}\right) + 2p_1p_2(1-\cos\theta_{12})\right]^{1/2} \quad , \tag{20}$$

where p_1 and p_2 are laboratory momenta of the two final-state tracks and θ_{12} is the laboratory angle between them. If we were to call both tracks pions and neglect m_1^2 and m_2^2, we would thus estimate

$$(m_{12}^{\rm est})^2 = 2p_1p_2(1-\cos\theta_{12}) = m_{12}^2 - m_1^2\left(1+\frac{p_2}{p_1}\right) + m_2^2\left(1+\frac{p_1}{p_2}\right) \quad . \tag{21}$$

For the case of symmetric momenta $p_1 = p_2$ corresponding to the Jacobian peak of the distribution, we would thus estimate

$$m_{12}^{\rm est} \simeq (m_{12} - 2m_1^2 - 2m_2^2)^{1/2} \quad , \tag{22}$$

or about 45 MeV below the B for $B \to K\pi$, $\simeq M_B$ for both $B \to \pi\pi$ and $B_s \to K\bar{K}$, and about 45 MeV above the B for $B_s \to K\pi$.

The CDF Detector at Run II of the Tevatron will have a time-of-flight system for particle identification, whose capabilities of distinguishing kaons from pions in B decay will be minimal. It will also make use of dE/dx discrimination. Later-generation detectors, such as LHC-b at CERN and the proposed BTeV detector at Fermilab, will have better capabilities for particle identification, allowing for cleaner separation of $\pi\pi$, $K\pi$, and $K\bar{K}$ final states of B and B_s decay.

The method based on $B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $B_s \to K^+K^-$ has the following points in its favor:

(1) It involves no small corrections from rescattering and color-suppressed electroweak penguin contributions. Also, certain ratios of form factors and decay constants cancel one another in the factorization limit, since one is only discussing asymmetries.

(2) Although the peaks for $B \to \pi\pi$ and $B_s \to K\bar{K}$ lie nearly on top of one another in the absence of particle identification, the time-dependent CP-violating rate differences in the two cases can be separated from one another (as long as they both are nonzero) by a frequency analysis. For the two asymmetries one would still need particle identification in order to distinguish between the denominators defining B^0 and B_s asymmetries.

(3) The analysis also allows for a lifetime difference between CP-even and CP-odd B_s mass eigenstates [21], which may allow resolution of some discrete ambiguities present in our scheme [3].

To conclude, we have found that simultaneous measurement of rates for $B^0 \to K^+\pi^-$, $B_s \to K^-\pi^+$, and their charge-conjugates can provide useful information on the weak phase γ. This measurement appears feasible at the Fermilab Tevatron and is an appealing possibility for other facilities envisioning B_s production, such as the HERA-B detector at DESY, the BTeV detector at Fermilab, and the LHC-b detector at CERN. Effects of SU(3) breaking and rescattering appear to be controllable and to some extent testable, while electroweak penguin effects are expected to be small enough that a determination of γ to better than 10° appears feasible. Our method, which can also be applied to time-integrated rates of $B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $B_s \to K^+K^-$, appears complementary to that [13, 21] based on time-dependent asymmetries in the latter processes, for which comparable accuracy in γ is expected [13]. Whereas the latter determination of γ could be affected by new physics contributions to $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing [22], our method is free of such modifications.

We thank S. Stone and F. Würthwein for useful discussions. M. G. would like to acknowledge the very kind hospitality of the Enrico Fermi Institute at the University of Chicago. This work was supported in part by the United States – Israel Binational Science Foundation under Research Grant Agreement 98-00237 and by the United States Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-FG02-90-ER40560.

References

[1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10** (1963) 531; M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49** (1973) 652.

[2] M. Gronau, J. Rosner and D. London, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** (1994) 21; R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B **365** (1996) 399; Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 093001; M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996) 1200; A. S. Dighe, M. Gronau, and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 3309; A. S. Dighe and J. L. Rosner, **54** (1996) 4677; R. Fleischer and T. Mannel, Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998) 2752; F. Würthwein and P. Gaidarev, hep-ph/9712531, December, 1997 (unpublished); M. Neubert and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Lett. B **441** (1998) 403; Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 5076; A. J. Buras, R. Fleischer, and T. Mannel, Nucl. Phys. **B533** (1998) 3; R. Fleischer and A. J. Buras, Eur. Phys. J. C **11** (1999) 93; M. Neubert, JHEP **9902** (1999) 014; M. Gronau and D. Pirjol, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 013005.

[3] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998) 6843.

[4] M. Gronau and D. Pirjol, Phys. Lett. B **449** (1999) 321.

[5] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras, and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68** (1996) 1125.

[6] B. Blok, M. Gronau, and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 3999; **79** (1997) 1167; A. Falk, A. L. Kagan, Y. Nir, and A. A. Petrov, Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998) 4290; M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998) 6843; **58** (1998) 113005; R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B **435** (1998) 221; Eur. Phys. J. C **6** (1999) 451.

[7] M. Gronau, D. Pirjol and T. -M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 034021.

[8] R. Fleischer, Eur. Phys. J. C **6** (1999) 451.

[9] CDF Collaboration, T. Affolder *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** (2000) 1663.

[10] S. Stone, private communication.

[11] M. Bander, D. Silverman, and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43** (1979) 242.

[12] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C. Sachrajda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 1914.

[13] F. Würthwein, talk for Working Group 1 presented at Workshop on B Physics at the Tevatron – Run II and Beyond, Fermilab, February 2000 (unpublished).

[14] R. Jesik, summary talk for Working Group 1 presented at Workshop on B Physics at the Tevatron – Run II and Beyond, Fermilab, February 2000 (unpublished).

[15] CLEO Collaboration, D. Cronin-Hennesy *et al.*, Cornell University report CLNS 99/1650, hep-ex/0001010, unpublished.

[16] CLEO Collaboration, G. Bonvicini *et al.*, Cornell University report CLNS 00/1661, hep-ex/0003004, unpublished.

[17] M. Bauer, B. Stech and M. Wirbel, Zeit. Phys. C **29** (1985) 637.

[18] P. Ball, JHEP **9809** (1998) 005.

[19] A. F. Falk, Y. Nir, and A. A. Petrov, JHEP **9912** (1999) 019.

[20] M. Gronau, O. F. Hernández, D. London and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **50** (1994) 4529.

[21] R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B **459** (1999) 306; DESY preprint DESY 00-014, hep-ph/0001253. See also I. Dunietz, Proceedings of the Workshop on *B* Physics at Hadron Accelerators, Snowmass, CO, 1993, p. 83; D. Pirjol, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 054020.

[22] Y. Nir and D. Silverman, Nucl. Phys. **B345** (1990) 301; C. O. Dib, D. London and Y. Nir, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **6** (1991) 1253; M. Gronau and D. London, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 2845.